

REMARKS

By this response, Applicants have not amended the claims. As a result, claims 24-47 remain pending in this application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Initially, Applicants thank the Examiner for his time and courtesy in conducting a telephonic interview with Applicants' undersigned attorney on September 17, 2008. During the interview, the rejection of claim 24 was discussed. In particular, the features of claim 24 were discussed in conjunction with the portions of U.S. Patent No. 6,967,728 (Vidyanand) that the Office cites as allegedly disclosing these features. No agreement was reached as a result of the interview, and no exhibits were presented during the interview. Additional aspects of the interview are included in the following remarks.

In the Final Office Action, the Office rejects claims 24-28, 30-39, and 41-47 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,967,728 (Vidyanand). Since the Office fails to show that Vidyanand describes each and every element of the claimed inventions, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of these rejections.

For example, as discussed during the interview, with respect to claim 24, the Office fails, *inter alia*, to show that Vidyanand describes previewing a document by generating a print file, transmitting the print file over a network, and receiving image data based on the transmitted print file as claimed therein. In support of its rejection, the Office cites Figs. 5-10 and col. 7, lines 61-67 as allegedly disclosing a method of previewing a document. Initially, Applicants note that these figures generally describe reusable and transferable printer preferences. See, e.g., Figs. 5-10; col. 4, lines 1-18; Abstract. Applicants submit that the reusable and transferable printer preferences of Vidyanand are unrelated to previewing a document.

Fig. 9 and col. 7, lines 61-67 of Vidyanand do include a page layout thumbnail preview 94 and a brief discussion thereof. However, Applicants note that the general setting interface 62 is included in a user interface 50 that is generated by a printer driver 14, which is disclosed as being located on a client computer 12. See, e.g., Figs. 1-4 and 9; col. 7, lines 44-47; and col. 7, line 61-col. 8, line 4. Further, Applicants note that Vidyanand does not discuss how the thumbnail preview 94 is generated. As a result, Applicants submit that the printer driver 14 of Vidyanand generates the thumbnail preview 94 without any communications over a network, as is known in the prior art.

In contrast, Applicants' invention of claim 24 previews a document by generating a print file based on the document, transmitting the print file to a server over a network, and receiving image data based on the transmitted print file on the client over the network.

The Office cites col. 5, lines 45-64 and col. 8, line 59-col. 9, line 52 of Vidyanand as allegedly disclosing receiving image data on the client over the network, the image data being based on a print file that is generated using a print driver on a client and transmitted to a server over as in claim 24. However, as discussed during the interview, Applicants note that the cited portions of Vidyanand merely discuss a set of printer driver preferences, which are required to successfully print a print job at a networked computer (col. 5, lines 45-64), and translating printer driver preferences for one printer for use on another printer (col. 8, line 59-col. 9, line 52). Applicants note that neither of the cited portions of Vidyanand include any discussion about image data, let alone receiving image data, which is based on a transmitted print file, on a client over a network as in claim 24.

During the telephone interview, the Examiner indicated that Vidyanand allegedly discloses communicating printer driver preference settings from a server to a client. Further, the

Examiner contends that these printer driver preference settings would be used on the client in order to preview the document. Even if, *arguendo*, the Examiner accurately states the teachings of Vidyanand, Vidyanand fails to disclose all of the features of claim 24. In particular, as discussed during the interview, claim 24 recites generating a print file based on a document, transmitting the print file to a server over a network, and receiving image data on the client, which is based on the transmitted print file. Applicants note that any communications from the client to the server in Vidyanand in order to request printer driver preference settings would not include transmitting a print file from the client to the server. Additionally, the print driver preference settings that are sent from the server to the client in Vidyanand would not include image data that is based on a transmitted print file.

To this extent, while the Office contends that Vidyanand allegedly discloses communications between a client and a server, which may subsequently enable a print preview, the Office fails to contend that Vidyanand discloses the transmission and receipt of any of the particular data of claim 24 (i.e., print file and image data) as part of previewing a document.

For example, in response to Applicants' previous arguments, the Office states that Vidyanand allegedly discloses "send[ing] the print file to a server for storage or printing... [and] describe[s] how the host computer creates the print job by using the print preference that allow the user to send the file to a network printer thru a server..." Final Office Action, p. 6, lines 1-4. However, Applicants note that sending a print file to a network printer thru a server is not relevant to previewing a document. In contrast, such an action would be performed as part of printing the document, which would occur after any preview of the document.

Further, in response to Applicants' previous arguments with respect to receiving image data based on a transmitted print file on the client, the Office states that Vidyanand allegedly

“describe[s] how data can be send (sic) to a client over the network from a server or storage or other clients.” Final Office Action, p. 6, lines 10-11. However, Applicants note that the Office merely contends that any data can be sent to a client. In contrast, claim 24 recites receiving image data on the client over the network, the image data being based on a transmitted print file. Applicants respectfully submit that the disclosure of the transmission of data that is distinct from the data of claim 24 fails to disclose the receiving of claim 24.

In light of the above-stated reasons, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections of claim 24 and claims 25-28, 30-31, and 44-47, which depend therefrom, as allegedly being anticipated by Vidyanand.

With respect to claim 32, Applicants note that the Office relies on its interpretation of Vidyanand as allegedly teaching all the features of claim 24. To this extent, Applicants hereby incorporate the arguments presented above for claim 24. As a result, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 32 and claims 33-35, which depend therefrom, as allegedly being disclosed by Vidyanand.

With respect to claim 36, Applicants note that the Office relies on its interpretation of Vidyanand as allegedly teaching all the features of claim 24. To this extent, Applicants hereby incorporate the arguments presented above for claim 24. As a result, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 36 and claims 37-39 and 41-43, which depend therefrom, as allegedly being disclosed by Vidyanand.

Further, the Office rejects claims 29 and 40 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Vidyanand in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0043753 (Grohs). With respect to claims 29 and 40, Applicants respectfully submit that the Office fails to show that each and every feature of the claimed invention is taught or suggested by the Office’s

proposed combination of Vidyanand in view of Grohs. Applicants note that the Office relies on its interpretation of Vidyanand as allegedly teaching all the features of claims 24 and 36, from which these claims respectively depend. To this extent, Applicants hereby incorporate the arguments presented above for claims 24 and 36. Further, Applicants note that the combination of Vidyanand and Grohs, even if, *arguendo*, proper, fails to address the deficiencies of Vidyanand cited above with respect to claims 24 and 36. As a result, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejections of claims 29 and 40 as allegedly being unpatentable over the combination of Vidyanand and Grohs.

Applicants submit that each of the pending claims is patentable for one or more additional unique features. To this extent, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Office's interpretation of the claimed subject matter or the references used in rejecting the claimed subject matter.

Additionally, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Office's combinations and modifications of the various references or the motives cited for such combinations and modifications. These features and the appropriateness of the Office's combinations and modifications have not been separately addressed herein for brevity. However, Applicants reserve the right to present such arguments in a later response should one be necessary.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/John LaBatt/

John W. LaBatt, Reg. No. 48,301
Hoffman Warnick LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, NY 12207
(518) 449-0044 - Telephone
(518) 449-0047 - Facsimile

Dated: 17 September 2008